



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

3

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/041,836	01/07/2002	Marshall O. Townsend II	GLFP-1-1001	4549

7590                  02/28/2003

Lawrence D. Graham, Esq.  
BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM PLLC  
816 Second Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98104

EXAMINER

LEGESSE, NINI F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3711	7

DATE MAILED: 02/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

10/041,836

Applicant(s)

TOWNSEND, MARSHALL O.

Examiner

Nini F. Legesse

Art Unit

3711

*--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

THE REPLY FILED 12 February 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See attachment.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1,4-6,9-13,20-22 and 25-31. 

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.



Paul T. Sewell  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Group 2700

Continuation of 10. Other: the request for reconsideration is acknowledged in paper no. 6. The final rejection stands because Applicant argument is not persuasive. In response to Applicant's argument that "the swing reference guide comprises a table of different shot types such as pull, hook, fade, or straight", Applicant misinterprets the principle that claims are interpreted in the light of the specification. Although these elements of the swing reference guide are found as examples or embodiments in the specification, they were not claimed explicitly. Nor were the words that are used in the claims defined in the specification to require these limitations. A reading of the specification provides no evidence to indicate that these limitations must be imported into the claims to give meaning to disputed terms. Applicant argues that Gibbs (US Patent No. 1,484,390) does not have a plurality of shot selection types on a single template, including a link between each one of the plurality shot selection types and one of the club path indicators," as recited in claim 1. However, it should be noted that Gibbs discloses a plurality of templates (for example 30,39,48) with different positions of the feet (for example, 31-32,40-41,49-50), with different positions of the hand (for example, 33,42,51), with different path of travel (36,45,54), and different types of instructions (38,47,56) to go with each template. And Manley (US Patent No. 2,707,638) discloses a plurality of club path indicators (14-21) on a single template. Thus, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a plurality of club paths as taught by Manley in the Gibbs device in order to provide a single device that can teach different swing paths for a golfer. If one combines Gibbs with Manley, it is obvious that the instructions of Gibbs (38, 47, 56) would be modified to include how to properly select and use the different club paths . And these instuctions could be called links because the modified temple would have a plurality of shot selection types and club path indicators .